REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed on June 9, 2008 has been reviewed. Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 9, 11-13, 16, 17, 19-21, and 23 have been amended. Claims 6-7, 14-15, and 22 have been canceled. Consequently, claims 1-5, 8-13, 16-21, and 23 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dailey, (U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0217093).

In order to expedite prosecution, claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, "determining, for each of the set of services associated with that periodic event, if that service is enabled for execution", which is substantially the same language as was previously recited in original claim 6.

In connection with the rejection of claim 6, the Office Action took the position that this new language is taught in the Abstract and paragraph [0034] of Dailey. The Office Action appears to be taking the position that the interrogation of "service variable 59" of Dailey teaches the language set forth above. It is noted, however, that the service variable 59 is merely the mechanism Dailey uses to cycle through the set of processing tasks that are to be performed. *See, e.g.,* Dailey, paragraph [0024] ("…the value of time variable 59 may be incremented by one, as described below in greater detail. Time variable 58 may be used to determine the execution trigger position within the bits of service variable 59, and the value of time variable 58."). Dailey is silent as to any mechanism for enabling and disabling the execution of any of the periodic processing tasks (and the checking for such enabling or disabling). Indeed, Dailey indicates that the schedule of such tasks does not change. *See, e.g.,* Dailey, paragraph [0020] ("Typically, microcontroller 20 utilizes task manager 22 to manage specific tasks retained in memory. Generally, these tasks are performed at various times and the schedule for performing the

tasks *usually does not change*. Specifically, task manager 22 may manage these tasks to be performed at given intervals.").

Claims 2-5 and 8 depend from claim 1. Therefore, at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply to these dependent claims.

Moreover, in order to expedite prosecution, claim 3 has been amended to recite "configuring at least one of the set of services associated with that periodic event in a one-shot mode in which the service is enabled for execution one time and then is disabled" and claim 4 has been amended to recite "configuring at least one of the set of services associated with that periodic event in a burst mode in which the service is enable for execution a predetermined number of times and then is disabled." It is respectfully submitted that the Dailey does not teach these modes.

In order to expedite prosecution, claims 6-7 have been cancelled.

In order to expedite prosecution, independent claims 9 and 17 have been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 and dependent claims 11-13 and 19-21 have been amended in a similar manner as claims 3-5. In particular, claim 9 has been amended to recite the language previously recited in claim 14, and claim 17 has been amended to recite the language previously recited in claim 21. Claims 14-15 and 22 have been canceled.

It is respectfully submitted that at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claims 1-8 apply to the rejections of claims 9-23.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims **1-5, 8-13, 16-21, and 23** are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2008-08-7	/Jon M. Powers/

Jon M.Powers
Reg. No. 43868

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg & Powers LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731